UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

CASE NO. 1:23-mc-00037

Petitioner,

V.

ORDER

EATON CORPORATION,

Respondent.

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

On April 1, 2025, the Sixth Circuit remanded this case for the limited purpose of having the Court conduct an in-camera review of the summonsed performance reviews at issue.¹ With its remand order, the Circuit denied Respondent Eaton Corporation's request to redact categories of information covered by GDPR Art. 9(1) prior to submission for in-camera review.² The Circuit explained that the Court's standing protective order³ "sufficiently addresses Eaton's desire for pre-review redactions."⁴ The Circuit also left any potential supplemental briefing to this Court's discretion.⁵

The Court sets the following schedule and procedure for this limited remand:

 By April 8, 2025, Respondent Eaton shall identify if there are any categories of information not covered by the Court's standing protective order that it would like to redact prior to submission for in-camera review.

¹ Doc. 47.

² *Id*.

³ Doc. 30.

⁴ Doc. 47.

⁵ *Id*.

Case: 1:23-mc-00037-JG Doc #: 48 Filed: 04/03/25 2 of 2. PageID #: 338

Case No. 1:23-mc-00037

Gwin, J.

• By April 14, 2025, the government shall indicate whether it objects to those

additional redactions and, if so, why it objects.

Respondent Eaton shall submit the summonsed performance reviews under

seal within ten (10) days of the Court resolving any redaction objection.

After receiving the summonsed reviews, the Court will order supplemental

briefing if necessary. Absent the Court's order, the parties shall not submit

additional briefing.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 3, 2025 s/ James S. Gwin

JAMES S. GWIN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE